



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/506,447	09/01/2004	Stanley Dawes Chamberlain	PU4759USW	9987
23347	7590	01/11/2007	EXAMINER	
GLAXOSMITHKLINE			BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN	
CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, MAI B475			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FIVE MOORE DR., PO BOX 13398			1624	
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709-3398				
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/11/2007	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/506,447	CHAMBERLAIN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Venkataraman Balasubramanian	1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 September 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-34 and 39-59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-34 and 39-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/1/2004.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

The preliminary amendment , which included cancellation of claims 36-38, 60 and amendment to claims 6-20, 31, 34, 39, 41-44 and 54, filed on 9/1/2004, is made of record. Claims 1-35 and 39-59 are now pending.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

References cited in the Information Disclosure Statements, filed on 9/1/2004, are made of record.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-35 and 39-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Following apply. Any claim not specifically rejected is rejected as it is dependent on a rejected claim and shares the same limitation.

1. Recitation of "physiologically functional derivative thereof" in claims 1, 2, 23-31, 34, 39, 41-44 and 53 renders these claims and their dependent claims indefinite as it is not clear what is the structural make-up "physiologically functional derivative". Note the term derivative implies more than what is being positively recited for compound of formula I. In addition, the variable groups of compound of formula I includes various functional groups. Therefore it is not clear what else is intended. It appears the phrase is meant for prodrugs. Prodrugs in general and as noted in specification, are

compounds, which undergo in vivo hydrolysis to parent active drugs. In that sense recitation of prodrug is acceptable. However, the definition of various variable groups include such groups, namely esters, amides, alkoxycarbonyl etc. and therefore it is not clear what is the difference between these variable groups and the prodrug groups. There is clear-cut ambiguity as to what is to be considered as prodrug and what is not. Applicants should note that if the variable groups are prodrug, which are in general inactive but becomes active upon in vivo transformation, then the compound bearing the variable group would be deemed as inactive which is not what the claim recites.

Furthermore, the issue on second paragraph is whether the structures of the claimed compounds are clearly defined. Applicants' "physiologically functional derivative" or "prodrugs" are molecules whose structure lie outside the subject matter of formula (I), but upon metabolism in the body are converted to active compounds falling within the structural scope of formula (I). The claim describes the function intended but provides no specific structural guidance to what constitutes a "prodrug". Structural formulas, names, or both can accurately describe organic compounds, which are the subject matter of claim 1. Attempting to define means by function is not proper when the means can be clearly expressed in terms that are more precise.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-35 and 39-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making pharmaceutically acceptable

salts does not reasonably provide enablement for making solvate. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The following apply.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

**1. The nature of the invention and the state of the prior art:**

The invention is drawn to compound of formula I, or a salt, solvate or physiologically functional derivative thereof. Specification is not adequately enabled as to how to make solvate of compounds of formula (I). Specification has no example of solvate of the instant compounds. Specification recites solvate thereof but there is no enabling of such compounds.

The instant claims 1, 2, 23-31, 34, 39, 41-44 and 53 embrace pyrimidine compounds substituted with aniline group and aminobenzimidazole group bearing variety of variable groups.

Even a cursory calculation of the number of compounds embraced in the instant formula (I) based on the generic definition of alkyl., aryl heteroaryl, heterocyclyl, substituted aryl, heteroaryl, arylalkyloxy, arylalkylthio etc would result in thousands of

compounds. This is of course not the accurate number and the true number of compounds would far exceed this number of compounds. Thus, the genus embraced in the claim 1 is too large and there is no teaching of any solvate of this large genus.

Search in the pertinent art, including water as solvent resulted in a pertinent reference, which is indicative of unpredictability of hydrate formation in general. The state of the art is that is not predictable whether solvates will form or what their composition will be. In the language of the physical chemist, a hydrate of organic molecule is an interstitial solid solution. This phrase is defined in the second paragraph on page 358 of West (Solid State Chemistry). The solvent molecule is a species introduced into the crystal and no part of the organic host molecule is left out or replaced. In the first paragraph on page 365, West (Solid State Chemistry) says, "it is not usually possible to predict whether solid solutions will form, or if they do form what is the compositional extent". Thus, in the absence of experimentation one cannot predict if a particular solvent will solvate any particular crystal. One cannot predict the stoichiometry of the formed solvate, i.e. if one, two, or a half a molecule of solvent added per molecule of host. Compared with polymorphs, there is an additional degree of freedom to hydrates, which means a different solvent or even the moisture of the air that might change the stable region of the hydrate. In the instant case of hydrate a similar reasoning therefore apply. Water is a solvent and hence it is held that a pertinent detail of West, which relates to solvates, is also applicable to hydrate

In addition, an additional search resulted in Vippagunta et al., Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews 48: 3-26, 2001, which clearly states that formation of hydrates in

unpredictable. See entire document especially page 18, right column section 3.4. Note Vippagunta et al., states "Each solid compound responds uniquely to the possible formation of solvates s and hence generalizations cannot be made for series of related compounds".

**2. The predictability or lack thereof in the art:**

Hence, the solvate as applied to the above-mentioned compounds claimed by the applicant are not art-recognized compounds and hence there should be adequate enabling disclosure in the specification with working example(s).

**3. The amount of direction or guidance present:**

Examples illustrated in the experimental section are limited to making the compounds not related to solvates and hydrates. There is no example of a solvate of instant compound. Over compounds were shown in the examples of the specification each of which has come in contact with water and other solvent but there is no showing that instant compounds formed solvates. Hence it is clear that merely bring the compound with solvent or water does not result in solvate and additional direction or guidance is needed to make them Specication has no such direction or guidance.

**4. The presence or absence of working examples:**

There is no working example of any solvate formed. The claims are drawn to hydrate, yet the numerous examples presented all failed to produce a solvate or even hydrate. These cannot be simply willed into existence. As was stated in Morton International Inc. v. Cardinal Chemical Co., 28 USPQ2d 1190 "The specification purports to teach, with over fifty examples, the preparation of the claimed compounds

with the required connectivity. However ... there, is no evidence that such compounds exist... the examples of the '881 patent do not produce the postulated compounds... there is ...‘ no evidence that such compounds even exist.” The same circumstance appears to be true here. There is no evidence that hydrates of these compounds actually exists; if they did, they would have formed. Hence, there should be showing supporting that solvates and hydrates of these compounds exist and therefore can be made.

**5. The breadth of the claims & the quantity of experimentation needed:**

Specification has no support, as noted above, for compounds generically embraced in the claims 1, 2, 23-30, 34, 39, 41-44 and 53 would lead to desired solvate of the compound of formula I. As noted above, the genus embraces over thousands of compounds and hence the breadth of the claim is broad. The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden on skilled art in the chemical art since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan for the many reasons stated above. Even with the undue burden of experimentation, there is no guarantee that one would get the product of desired hydrate of compound of formula I embraced in the instant claims in view of the pertinent reference teachings.

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, “A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir.1993).” That conclusion is

Art Unit: 1624

clearly justified here. Thus, undue experimentation will be required to make Applicants' invention.

Claims 34 and 39-59 are rejected under U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification while being enabling for treating breast cancer, does not reasonably provide enablement for treating any or all tumoral disease generically embraced in these claims. The specification does not enable any physician skilled in the art of medicine, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The instant method of use claims 34 and 39-59 are drawn to treating a disorder in a mammal mediated by at least one inappropriate TIE-2 and VEGFR-2 activity by inhibiting these receptor in general. Instant claims, as recited, are reach through claims. A reach through claim is a claim drawn to a mechanistic, receptor binding or enzymatic functionality in general format and thereby reach through a scope of invention for which they lack adequate written description and enabling disclosure in the specification.

In the instant case, based on the inhibition of TIE-2 and VEGFR-2 activity by the instant compounds, claims 34 and 39-59 are reaching through treating any or all disorders including cancer in general and thereby they lack adequate written description and enabling disclosure in the specification.

More specifically, in the instant case, based on the mode of action of instant compounds as inhibitor of TIE-2 and VEGFR-2 activity, it is claimed that treating any or all disorders including cancer in general. The scope of the claims includes any or all disorders due to TIE-2 and VEGFR-2 activity for which there is no enabling disclosure. In addition, the scope of treatment of cancer would include treatment of various cancers

Art Unit: 1624

including group consisting of lung cancer, bone cancer, pancreatic cancer, skin cancer, cancer of the head or neck, cutaneous or intraocular melanoma, uterine cancer, ovarian cancer, rectal cancer, cancer of the anal region, stomach cancer, colon cancer, breast cancer, uterine cancer, carcinoma of the fallopian tubes, carcinoma of the endometrium, carcinoma of the cervix, carcinoma of the vagina, carcinoma of the vulva, Hodgkin's disease, cancer of the esophagus, cancer of the small intestine, cancer of the endocrine system, cancer of the thyroid gland, cancer of the parathyroid gland, cancer of the adrenal gland, sarcoma of soft tissue, cancer of the urethra, cancer of the penis, prostate cancer, chronic or acute leukemia, lymphocytic lymphomas, cancer of the bladder, cancer of the kidney or ureter, renal cell carcinoma, carcinoma of the renal pelvis, neoplasms of the central nervous system (CNS), primary CNS lymphoma, spinal axis tumors, brain stem glioma, pituitary adenoma, or a combination of one or more of the foregoing cancers, which is not adequately enabled solely based on the activity of the compounds provided in the specification. The instant compounds are disclosed to have receptor TIE-2 and VEGFR-2 inhibitory activity and it is recited that the instant compounds are therefore useful in treating any or all diseases stated above for which applicants provide no competent evidence. It appears that the applicants are asserting that the embraced compounds because of their mode action as inhibitor of TIE-2 and VEGFR-2 activity that would be useful for all sorts of cancers and disorders. However, the applicants have not provided any competent evidence that the instantly disclosed tests are highly predictive for all the uses disclosed and embraced by the claim language for the intended host. Moreover many if not most of diseases such as

psoriasis, lung cancer, brain cancer, pancreatic cancer, colon cancer etc. are very difficult to treat and despite the fact that there are many anticancer drugs.

The scope of the claims involves thousands of compounds of claim 1 as well as the thousand of diseases embraced by the terms disorder and cancer.

Cancer is just an umbrella term. Tumors vary from those so benign that they are never treated to those so virulent that all present therapy is useless.

No compound has ever been found to treat cancers of all types generally. Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in medicine, proof must be provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits. The existence of such a "compound" is contrary to our present understanding of oncology. Cecil Textbook of Medicine states, "each specific type has unique biologic and clinical features that must be appreciated for proper diagnosis, treatment and study" (see the enclosed article, page 1004). Different types of cancers affect different organs and have different methods of growth and harm to the body. Thus, it is beyond the skill of oncologists today to get an agent to be effective against cancers generally. Note substantiation of utility and its scope is required when utility is "speculative", "sufficiently unusual" or not provided. See Ex parte Jovanovics, 211 USPQ 907, 909; In re Langer 183 USPQ 288. Also note Hoffman v. Klaus 9 USPQ 2d 1657 and Ex parte Powers 220 USPQ 925 regarding type of testing needed to support in vivo uses.

Also see the PTO website

<<[>>](http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/1 pecba.htm#7)

ENABLEMENT DECISION TREE, Example F, situation 1) which is directed to the scope of cancers.

Next, applicant's attention is drawn to the Revised Utility and Written Description Guidelines, at 66 FR 1092-1099, 2001 wherein it is emphasized that 'a claimed invention must have a specific and substantial utility'. The disclosure in the instant case is not sufficient to enable the instantly claimed method treating solely based on the inhibitory activity disclosed for the compounds. The state of the art is indicative of the requirement for undue experimentation. See Sennlaub et al., *The Journal of Clinical Investigation* 107(6): 717-725, 2001. Also see Connell et al. *Exp. Opin. Ther. Patents* (2001) 11(1):77-114, especially page 109 closing paragraph and Klement et al., *The Journal of Clinical Investigation* 105(8): R15-R24, 2000. Also, note MPEP 2164.08(b) which states that claims that read on "... significant numbers of inoperative embodiments would render claims nonenabled when the specification does not clearly identify the operative embodiments and undue experimentation is involved in determining those that are operative.". Clearly that is the case here.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

Art Unit: 1624

1) The nature of the invention: Therapeutic use of the compounds in treating disorders and cancer that require TIE-2 and VEGFR-2 inhibitory activity.

2) The state of the prior art: Recent publications expressed that the TIE-2 and VEGFR-2 activity inhibition effects are unpredictable and are still exploratory. The state of the art is indicative of the requirement for undue experimentation. See Sennlaub et al., Connell et al and Klement et al., cited above.

3) The predictability or lack thereof in the art: Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use for treating any or all cancers or disorders by the instant compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, "the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved". See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

4) The amount of direction or guidance present and 5) the presence or absence of working examples: Specification has no working examples to show treating any or all cancer or any or all disorders and the state of the art is that the effects of TIE-2 and VEGFR-2 activity inhibitors are unpredictable.

6) The breadth of the claims: The instant claims embrace treatment of any or all cancer and any disorders with large genus of compounds.

7) The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden to one skilled in the pharmaceutical arts since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan, regarding the pharmaceutical use, for the reasons stated above.

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and "predictability", etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instant case for the instant method claims. In view of the breadth of the claims, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of enzyme-inhibitor interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds towards treating the variety of diseases of the instant claims, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the instantly claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

MPEP §2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was 'filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here and undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is James O. Wilson, whose telephone number is 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (571) 273-8300. Any

Art Unit: 1624

inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

*Venkataraman Balasubramanian*  
Venkataraman Balasubramanian

4/7/2007